

TRIBUTE TO BRADFORD MORSE

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 3, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a former colleague, and one of the founders of the House Wednesday Group, Representative Bradford Morse. The objectives of Brad and the others in starting the Wednesday Group was to foster and promote moderate, Republican ideas. This temperate philosophy carried over to Representative Morse's work as a legislator as he served on the Government Operations and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees, and later on Foreign Affairs. On behalf of the members of the Wednesday Group, we deeply regret his passing.

Much to the credit of Mr. Morse, he never forgot the reason he was able to work in this body and establish the group that still meets. The constituents of his Massachusetts district were always a priority. He began contributing to the State early in his career, long before his time here in Washington. Mr. Morse pursued all phases of his education in his home State, and decided to practice and teach law there as well. Appropriately, he also served on the Lowell City Council, the town in which he was born. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Brad Morse was a man of integrity, a man whose heritage defined his successful career.

After he left Congress, Mr. Morse continued to make a significant contribution as he worked to achieve international peace at the United Nations. In his role as administrator for the U.N.'s Development Programme, Mr. Morse set out to accomplish monumental tasks. Accordingly, and in his typical fashion, the effects of the results he achieved were also monumental.

Mr. Speaker, although I am saddened to be addressing you on the occasion of Brad Morse's passing, it is my privilege and honor to associate myself with the ideas he represented. Perhaps the greatest tribute my colleagues and I can pay to the late Representative is to continue the thoughtful undertakings of the group he founded nearly 30 years ago.

AMERICAN PEOPLE DEMAND
CHANGE—LESS GOVERNMENT,
LESS TAXES, LESS REGULATION

SPEECH OF

HON. RANDY TATE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

(Mr. TATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, to my Democrat friends across the aisle, I say, methinks thou doth protest too much.

I have heard for weeks personal attacks on our Republican leaders and delay tactics. I ask, is it because you have nothing else to say?

I know that losing power must be difficult to deal with. But the message last November was not more fighting, more finger pointing, and more personal attacks. It was less government,

less taxes, and less regulations. We have defied the odds by passing a balanced budget amendment, and we will pass an unfunded mandates bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have said they want a change. The Democrats have tried their patience long enough.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
TO MAKE THE R&D CREDIT PER-
MANENT

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 3, 1995

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HERGER, and I introduced legislation to make permanent the Research and Development [R&D] tax credit. U.S. based R&D is critical to our continued economic growth. The R&D credit provides a significant incentive for U.S. companies of perform valuable R&D in the United States providing high-skilled, high-paid jobs for American workers.

The R&D credit was enacted in 1981 to provide an incentive for companies to increase their spending on U.S. R&D. The credit requires companies to increase their current year R&D spending above a predetermined base before they are eligible to receive the credit. Since 1981, the credit has been extended five times and changed to reduce the benefits available to certain companies. The current R&D credit expires on June 30, 1995.

Failure to make the credit permanent has substantially reduced its value to business. Research and Development projects are generally long-term efforts, often spanning 5–10 years. Corporate research planners can not rely on the incentive provided by the R&D tax credit if it is extended for only 12–18 months at a time.

I believe New England would substantially benefit from a permanent R&D credit. New England is still trying to recover from difficult economic times. A permanent R&D credit will provide a significant incentive for New England companies to perform R&D in New England. The technological innovations perfected through R&D are necessary to assist New England companies that are undergoing defense conversion to compete in the market place.

R&D will help rebuild our economy. I urge you to support this legislation.

KEEPING THE CONTRACT WITH
AMERICA ON TRACK

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 3, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the new Republican Congress continues to carry out its mandate with the American people. We are committed to keeping our Contract With America on track. The American people demanded a Congress that produces results. That's what our contract is about.

We are committed to reducing the size, cost, and scope of Government. So far, we

have kept our promise to balance the budget and reform unfunded mandates. Next, we will vote on passage of a line-item veto, a sharp tool to give the President to cut bloated, wasteful Government spending. It will fundamentally change the budget process—in favor of wise spending.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican agenda for change continues. Gone are the days of empty rhetoric. The new Congress works for results, not empty promises. Mr. Speaker, I hope America is watching and checking off the items in our contract. We are working for them.

THE WAR ON DRUGS: RENEWING
THE BATTLE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 3, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, during the 1980's, the message to Americans was "Just Say No to Drugs and Alcohol." Children were admonished by their sports and entertainment heroes to stay away from marijuana and cocaine. Statistics show that the message was working, at least as far as adolescent drug use was concerned. But during the Clinton administration, the war on drugs has been downsized and their supporters in the drug culture are claiming it can't be won. As the following article emphasizes, teenagers are showing a renewed interest in illegal drugs. Without the constant reminders to avoid these mind-numbing and brain killing substances, kids have begun testing the waters. The only way to safeguard the future of America is to stop this experimentation before the sharks take over again.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 18, 1995]

(By Gerald F. Seib)

DRUG COMEBACK: ONE SAD TREND LOST IN
SHUFFLE

The new Congress isn't exactly short of things to do, but here's one task crying out for attention: putting a stop to the backsliding underway in the national war against drugs.

Subtly, almost imperceptibly, drug use is creeping back up among America's youth. Worse yet, all the warning signs of bigger problems ahead are flashing. Use of marijuana, often a precursor of cocaine use, is up sharply among teens. Simultaneously, young people's perception that drugs are risky is declining, an attitude change that usually forecasts an actual upturn in drug use.

At least one powerful voice is trying to persuade the new, Republican-controlled Congress to fix its eyes on this troubling picture. The voice belongs to William Bennett, the former drug czar, who has been pressing new GOP members to get drugs onto at least their second 100 days' agenda. His message, Mr. Bennett says, is simply this: "You cannot ignore it."

In truth, though, ignoring the problem is what a lot of people, in Congress and out, have been doing. Consequently, the country is in a position roughly akin to that of a drug abuser who may appear to be recovering but who actually is in grave danger of a relapse.

Over the last few years, it was possible to conclude that, outside of the inner cities,

broader American society had finally turned the tide in its long battle against illegal drugs. Studies by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, for instance, showed that drug use among high school seniors declined gradually but steadily through the second half of the 1980s and into the 1990s. Not coincidentally, perceptions that regular drug use was risky rose through the same period.

Now, those comforting trendlines have turned. The University of Michigan research shows that illicit drug use has been rising, slowly but clearly, among eighth and 10th graders and high school seniors in each of the last two years. Particularly alarming was the rise found in the use of marijuana. Over the past two to three years, the share of students reporting use of marijuana at least once in the past year has doubled among eighth graders, grown by two-thirds among 10th graders, and jumped by 40% among high school seniors.

The rise in marijuana use is particularly troubling, because historical trends show that marijuana is a "gateway" drug often leading to other drugs. Recent studies by Columbia University's Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, or CASA, document a link between marijuana, as well as alcohol and tobacco, and later cocaine use. To put a grim human face on the latest statistics, CASA estimates that the jump in youthful marijuana use means 820,000 more young Americans will try cocaine in their lifetime, and that 58,000 of them will become regular cocaine users as adults.

Why is this happening? The best guess is the broadest one. The country is letting down its collective guard.

For starters, society generally has stopped pounding home the theme that drugs are dangerous, meaning that a whole new set of young Americans isn't getting the same kind of clear signal their older brothers and sisters did. "The message is getting mixed," frets Joseph Califano, the former health, education and welfare secretary and CASA's chairman. "It's everything from the fact that we're starting to see pot come back to the movies and the music business, which are incredibly important to young people, to the fact that Jocelyn Elders is sending out an ambiguous message."

Surgeon General Elders has just departed, of course, so now it's up to President Clinton and his administration to undo any damage her casual remarks about possible drug legalization may have done. But the problem is hardly confined to the Clinton administration. Congress is equally complicit in toning down the anti-drug message.

In the budget he presented for the current fiscal year, Mr. Clinton proposed spending \$659.2 million on a program to help ensure safe and drug-free schools. Congress last year chopped that request down by 27%, to \$482 million.

Now comes the new Republican Congress, which will be torn between its budget-cutting impulses and the painful fact that programs to interdict drugs and prevent their use cost money. This is one area where anti-crime bromides alone won't suffice. Some in the drug-fighting community are particularly worried that, as spending on federal social programs gets packed into block grants and shipped out to the states, drug-fighting will get pushed to the back of the line of competing claims.

For his part, Mr. Bennett suggests that existing federal and state law-enforcement money could be used for a "targeted, intense effort at closing down drug markets in the cities." The first battle, though, isn't against drug dealers. It's against creeping national complacency.

For starters, society generally has stopped pounding home the theme that drugs are

dangerous, meaning that a whole new set of young Americans isn't getting the same kind of clear signal their older brothers and sisters did. "The message is getting mixed," frets Joseph Califano, the former health, education and welfare secretary and CASA's chairman. "It's everything from the fact that we're starting to see pot come back to the movies and the music business, which are incredibly important to young people, to the fact that Jocelyn Elders is sending out an ambiguous message."

Surgeon General Elders has just departed, of course, so now it's up to President Clinton and his administration to undo any damage her casual remarks about possible drug legalization may have done. But the problem is hardly confined to the Clinton administration. Congress is equally complicit in toning down the anti-drug message.

In the budget he presented for the current fiscal year, Mr. Clinton proposed spending \$659.2 million on a program to help ensure safe and drug-free schools. Congress last year chopped that request down by 27%, to \$482 million.

Now comes the new Republican Congress, which will be torn between its budget-cutting impulses and the painful fact that programs to interdict drugs and prevent their use cost money. This is one area where anti-crime bromides alone won't suffice. Some in the drug-fighting community are particularly worried that, as spending on federal social programs gets packed into block grants and shipped out to the states, drug-fighting will get pushed to the back of the line of competing claims.

For his part, Mr. Bennett suggests that existing federal and state law-enforcement money could be used for a "targeted, intense effort at closing down drug markets in the cities." The first battle, though, isn't against drug dealers. It's against creeping national complacency.

HONEST WORK EQUALS JUST REWARD

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 3, 1995

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of welfare, specifically, reforming our welfare system. How can we, as a Congress, and as a society, make welfare reform work?

I'll tell you how—by paying people a livable wage. Individuals must be able to earn a decent wage for a day's work. We have to pay our workers enough to live on, enough to keep themselves and their families above the poverty level.

Current discussion of welfare reform would require recipients to find gainful employment. Gainful employment should at least be a viable alternative, providing adequate compensation for workers and their families. The only way to achieve this is to increase minimum wage levels. If wages had kept up with inflation after 1970, the current rate would have risen to \$5.54.

I am urging that we immediately raise the minimum wage to \$5.50, and index it for inflation, in order to avoid this injustice in the future. We must protect the interest of America's working class by offering fair compensation for honest work. This is the way we take people off of welfare. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION AFFILIATION ACT

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 3, 1995

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to join my distinguished colleague, Congressman BAKER of Louisiana, in introducing the Depository Institution Affiliation Act of 1995.

We are on the brink of a new century. Yet the laws which govern the financial services system which must meet the demands of that century are antiquated. They reflect a world in which only banks offered bank services; major corporations relied primarily on banks for their financing; consumer needs were simply and easily segregated into discrete products offered by distinct industries; and U.S. banks were easily preeminent at home and abroad.

That world no longer exists. Technology and product innovation have blurred the lines between various financial products and the businesses of the companies which provide them. Increasingly, individual and corporate customers have their financial needs met through new financial products provided outside the traditional U.S. banking system. Strong competition from foreign banks, which operate within legal structures which recognize rather than ignore new market dynamics, pose a serious competitive challenge to U.S. institutions in both foreign markets and our own.

As policymakers have failed to address these issues and U.S. law has remained static, the banking system has attempted to respond to new consumer demands and market developments through ad hoc regulatory adjustments and strained and unduly complex efforts by the banks to devise products and structures which might allow them to meet new demand within the limitations current law permits. The result has been a system that is excessively costly, complex, and inefficient. It undercuts our international competitiveness, limits consumer choice and convenience, and ultimately suppresses economic growth.

This cannot continue. In a competitive global marketplace, we can no longer afford to be indifferent to something as critical as the financial system which underpins our economy.

In 1991, I had the privilege of chairing a Banking Committee Task Force on the International Competitiveness of U.S. Financial Institutions. After an exhaustive analysis of the condition of U.S. banks and the challenges they faced, that task force concluded it was absolutely incumbent upon policymakers to undertake a fundamental and comprehensive reassessment of the major laws and the regulatory structure which underpin the U.S. banking system. Four years have passed and, while there has been some progress—most notably last year's interstate legislation—and much effort, the structure of our financial system has remained substantially unchanged and U.S. banks still face the same problems and constraints.

We can no longer respond to the serious problems our outdated financial services system imposes by peripheral change. The task force had a much broader vision of what needed to be done, and the bill we are introducing today responds to that vision. While this bill may not be perfect, it will facilitate a